

Appl. No. : 10/511,397
Filed : October 14, 2004

REMARKS

The Abstract has been amended for brevity and to reduce legal language. The amendment to the Abstract does not add new matter.

Applicants have canceled Claims 1 and 3 without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter contained therein. Applicants maintain that the cancellation of a claim makes no admission as to its patentability and reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in this or any other patent application.

Claim 2 has been amended to independent form, and Claims 4, 5 and 7-9 are amended to change their dependency in view of the cancellation of Claim 1. These amendments do not add new matter.

Claims 2 and 4-19 are pending in this application.

Objections to the Specification: Abstract

The Abstract is objected to as being too long and containing legal language. Applicants have amended the Abstract for brevity and to reduce legal language. Applicants submit that the Abstract, as amended, is of acceptable length and contains acceptable language. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicants respectfully request that specific language of the Abstract be identified which remains objectionable.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-19 are provisionally rejected as not patentably distinguishable from Claims 1 and 3-10 of U.S. App. Ser. No. 10/510,466 in view of U.S. App. Ser. No. 10/983,520.

Applicants submit that they will file a Terminal Disclaimer, if appropriate, upon indication of otherwise allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-19 are provisionally rejected as not patentably distinguishable from Claims 1 and 3-10 of U.S. App. Ser. No. 10/510,466 in view of U.S. App. Ser. No. 10/029,721 (now U.S. Pat. No. 6,861,121).

Applicants submit that they will file a Terminal Disclaimer, if appropriate, upon indication of otherwise allowable subject matter.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Fuji in view of Suzuki (US Pub. 2002/0150722). The Office Action states that Fuji teaches all elements of the claims except spacing and roughness, and that Suzuki teaches spacing and roughness.

Claims 1 and 3 are canceled. Accordingly, the rejection as it applies to Claims 1 and 3 is now moot.

Claims 4-12 ultimately depend from Claim 2. Applicants submit that Claim 2 is non-obvious over the cited references. The Office Action's position on Claim 2 is consistent with Applicants' position; the Office Action has indicated that Claim 2 would be allowable if amended to independent form. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 4-12 which now depend from Claim 2, also are non-obvious over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as to Claims 14-19.

Suzuki teaches use of a resin and non-agglomerative particles to form an antiglare film having a concave and convex-shaped surface.

Fuji teaches a film having a thermoplastic resin A having a substituted or non-substituted imide group at a side chain of the resin A, and a thermoplastic resin B having a substituted or non-substituted phenyl group and a nitrile group at a side chain of the resin B. Fuji teaches that the transparent film has poor adhesive strength and is subject to peeling:

When another film or glass is laminated to such a surface having low surface energy via an adhesive or glue, *it is difficult to obtain sufficient adhesive strength or glue strength and both are likely to be peeled apart from each other.* Even when initial adhesive strength is sufficient, the adhesive strength or glue strength is likely to be reduced in a long-term use, so that both become likely to be peeled apart from each other. The speed of reduction of the adhesive strength varies depending on environmental conditions, but the adhesive strength is reduced in any environmental condition. Fuji at [0182] (emphasis added).

Thus, Fuji teaches that the transparent film provided by Fuji has limitations of poor adhesive strength and susceptibility to peeling. Suzuki is silent regarding adhesiveness, and therefore, Suzuki provides no teaching or suggestion for curing the problem taught by Fuji. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have no reason to suspect that a combination of the

Appl. No. : 10/511,397
Filed : October 14, 2004

teachings of Fuji with the teachings of Suzuki would result in a light-diffusing sheet comprising a light-diffusing layer without the peeling and weak adhesiveness problems taught by Fuji.

In contrast, the transparent film of the present application shows excellent adhesion to the resin coating layer. *See Specification* at page 52, line 7, through page 53, line 1, and Table 1. No combination of Fuji and Suzuki teaches or suggests a transparent film with such excellent adhesive properties. As such, the adhesiveness of the claimed transparent film is unexpected over the references. Applicants submit that, in view of the unexpected adhesiveness of the claimed transparent film, Claim 14 is non-obvious over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection of Claim 14, and Claims 15-19 which depend therefrom.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8, 11, 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Fuji in view of Suzuki and in further view of Winston (US Pub. 2002/0061178). The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to combine the low refractive index layer of Winston with the inventions of Fuji and Suzuki.

Claims 8, 11 and 12 ultimately depend from Claim 2. Applicants submit that Claim 2 is non-obvious over the cited references. The Office Action's position on Claim 2 is consistent with Applicants' position; the Office Action has indicated that Claim 2 would be allowable if amended to independent form. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 8, 11 and 12 which now depend from Claim 2, also are non-obvious over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as to Claim 19.

Claim 19 depends from Claim 14. As Applicants have indicated above, the claimed transparent film is non-obvious over any combination of Fuji and Suzuki because the claimed transparent film possesses adhesiveness characteristics that are unexpected over these references. Winston provides no teaching beyond that of Fuji and Suzuki which would render the transparent film of Claim 14 obvious. Winston teaches an optical device for collecting light and selectively outputting or concentrating the light. However, nothing in Winston teaches or suggests modification of a transparent film such as that provided by Fuji to reduce the limitations of poor adhesive strength and susceptibility to peeling. Accordingly, nothing in Winston cures that which is missing in Fuji and Suzuki. Therefore, no combination of the cited references render

Appl. No. : 10/511,397
Filed : October 14, 2004

Claim 14 or any claim dependent therefrom obvious. As such, Applicants submit that Claim 19 is non-obvious over the cited references.

CONCLUSION


In view of the above, Applicant respectfully maintains that claims are patentable and request that they be passed to issue. Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if any remaining issues might be resolved by telephone.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 4-Oct-06

By: 
Kerry Taylor
Registration No. 43,947
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550